

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-16, 19 and 20 are pending.

Claims 1, 3-7, 9, 10, 16 and 19-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 (b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 103 (a) as obvious over Hansen et al. US 5,589,256, the '256 reference.

Claims 1, 3-7, 10 -12, 16 and 19 -20 are rejected under 35 U.S. C. 102 (b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as obvious over Hansen et al. (5,789,326).

Claim 8-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hansen et al. ('256 or '326) in view of Smith et al. U.S. 2002/0090511.

Claims 13 -15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as unpatentable over Hansen et al. ('326).

Claims 11-15 are rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as unpatentable over Hansen et al. ('256) in view of Hansen et al. US 5,789,326, the '326 reference.

Claims 1, 5-8 and 10-15 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over (renumbered) claims 1-9 and 11-12 in copending Application No. 10/748977.

Claims 1, 5-8, 10-12 and 16 are provisionally rejected under the doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over Claims 1-8 of copending Application No. 10/815206.

Claims 1, 3-8, 10, and 12-16 are rejected under the doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over Claims 1-14 of copending Application No. 10/748969.

Interview

Applicant's Agent appreciates the interview with the Examiner on January 9, 2008. Potential amendments and the need to provide evidence that the claimed product is structurally different from the prior art were discussed. The Interview Summary was provided by the Examiner on the same day.